



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

totally in the dark, whether he *does* believe, or *does not* believe, that the visible Church must be always free from error and corruption in doctrine, and that the Church of Rome was right in that question of Berengarius.

Now, this is the very question at issue between "Philethes" and us, "whether the visible Church must always be free from error and corruption in doctrine; and whether the Church of Rome was free from error in the case of Berengarius." How can we discuss that question with him, till we know which side he takes, and what his opinion is?

If he think that the visible Church is liable to error and corruption in doctrine, then he thinks as we do, and there is no difference between us about the visible Church. If he think that the visible Church is not liable to error or corruption of doctrine, and will tell us plainly that this is his opinion, then we will discuss that opinion with him. But it is not possible for us to discuss his opinion with him without knowing plainly what his opinion is.

We therefore call upon him again to answer this plain question, and when he answers it, as we hope he will in our next number, we will go on with the discussion.

In like manner, if our correspondent wishes us to discuss whether the Greek Church be a part of the visible Church of Christ, we would ask him to state his own opinion whether it be a part of the visible Church or not. If he think it is, we have no difference with him; if he think it is not, we will discuss it with him. He speaks of the Eastern Churches as "denying the Holy Ghost;" we were not aware of this; but if he can show us that it is so, we will not claim the Greek Church as a part of the visible Church of Christ.

We trust our correspondent will think that we have put the question fairly now.

THE CHURCH VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Carlow.

SIR—In the last paragraph of "The Church Visible and Invisible" you earnestly invite Roman Catholics to the statement of Augustine's doctrine of the Church, then asking how can we pretend to say our Church is without "spot or wrinkle?" (Before I go farther, I consider this article the most temperate and candid that I have seen in any Protestant journal—it is almost Catholic.) When we quote "without spot or wrinkle," in defence of our Church, it is for her infallibility and teaching, not for the moral rectitude of her sons individually, for the cockle must needs grow among the wheat to the end of time.

You fairly remark that the Church is visible and invisible. Nothing can be more plain and simple, if you allow those that are yet to be gathered in to the true fold to be the invisible, and those that are now of the Church are visible. By their fruits you will know them.

Now, the true Church being always visible, as can be proved by many texts of Scripture, may I ask what became of its visibility at the dawning of the Reformation? Before Martin Luther was born there was a visible true Church; when he was a monk there was a visible true Church; when he broached his new doctrine there was a visible true Church; when he said emphatically he stood alone, there was a visible true Church. I stand alone! Against what? Against a Church—the true, visible Church. This was a true admission of Luther's. He stood alone—the one, solitary spark, that was afterwards to be fanned into a flame, as it were, by the four winds of heaven, and then settle down, like the lava of some burning mountain. This doctrine of Luther's was not in accordance with the then visible Church. Either Luther in person was the visible Church, or he was not. If he was the true Church, what became of the Church Catholic? for he could not then claim that title, and those that were afterwards his followers were not of his Church, visible or invisible, as they knew not his teaching while yet in the embryo of his brain. We no more contend for the infallibility of an individual than we do for the spiritual supremacy of the reigning monarch over the Catholic Church.

I am, sir, your obedient, humble servant,

A ROMAN CATHOLIC.

We sincerely thank our correspondent for his kind expressions and his candid opinion of our article; and we sincerely assure him that it is our earnest desire to be, not only almost, but altogether Catholic; and that any attempt to show us where we fail to be Catholic, or where we fall into any error, will always be esteemed by us as a kindness.

We are aware that many Roman Catholics do quote "without spot or wrinkle," rather in respect of the infallibility of their Church, than for the moral rectitude of her sons individually. One chief object in that article was to lead candid Roman Catholics to consider that distinction more carefully, and to examine how far it can be sustained.

We find in Scripture many great and glorious promises made to the Church of Christ. We find also a great tendency in many Roman Catholics to apply all those promises generally to the visible Church of Rome, as she now is. We show them some promises which appear to speak of the Church as without sin, and then they admit that these must be spoken of the Church as she appears in the sight of God, who alone knows who do truly and really

belong to him. Then we show them other promises which speak of the Church as being without error, and we ask them to consider whether it may not also be possible that these promises, too, belong to the Church as God sees her, rather than to the Church as she is visible to man.

We ask them to consider *why* they admit that the promises of being *all holy* cannot be applied to the visible Church of Rome and to all her members; they will say—"because we see many sinful persons, popes, bishops, clergy, and laity, in her." A very good reason, no doubt. In the same way, if it should appear that the Church of Rome has really erred, then it will be equally necessary to apply, just in the same way, those promises that seem to speak of infallibility. We now ask our correspondent to consider carefully the articles now in progress in our pages about the question whether the Apocrypha be really the inspired Word of God. If, as we proceed with our proofs, he should see reason to think that the Church of Rome has really erred in this great question, he must surely then see, that promises that seem to speak of infallibility cannot be applied rightly to the visible Church of Rome; and then the article in our last paper, which he already considers "almost Catholic," may help him out of that difficulty.

We ask him, also, to consider whether the decision which the Pope and Council made against Berengarius was right or not. If he cannot venture to say it was right, why are we talking about infallibility any longer? He will find that decision again in this number, in our reply to the letter of "Philethes."

We now ask him to consider again what he has said—"When we quote, 'without spot or wrinkle,' in defence of our Church, it is for her infallibility and teaching, not for the moral rectitude of her sons individually." Now, we think the question is—"Did St. Paul mean to say it of her infallibility and teaching?" Here are St. Paul's words, from the Douay Bible—"That he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish."—Eph. v. 27. Was St. Paul speaking here of infallibility in teaching, or of holiness in heart and life? It seems clear to us that St. Paul speaks of the latter; and if this be so, what right have Roman Catholics to insist on applying it to infallibility?

Our correspondent has not quite correctly understood the distinction between the Church visible and invisible. By the Church visible, we mean the Church as men see it; by the Church invisible, the Church as she really is in herself, and as God sees her—who sees all things as they really are. A man who makes an outward profession of believing and obeying the Gospel, without having the Holy Spirit in his heart, appears to men to be a member of the Church; but God, who looks into the heart, sees that such a one is no real member of the Church of Christ.

Our correspondent's difficulty about Luther reminds us of a famous saying about a famous case in the ancient Church. The stand which the great Athanasius made for the Catholic faith about the Trinity was thus described—"All the world against Athanasius, and Athanasius against all the world." Will our correspondent, therefore, deny the Trinity? Will he say, "How could Athanasius be the Catholic Church? and, if he were not, where was it?"

This question about Luther is, in fact, no difficulty at all to us. Luther was not a member of the Church of England and Ireland. Nor was that Church founded by Luther; nor did it even consist of followers of Luther—though agreeing with Luther in many things. Our correspondent will agree with us that there was a Church in England before the Reformation. We say that very Church rejected some errors which it had formerly held: rejecting error does not make a Church cease to be a Church; because it is not holding error that constitutes a Church. If any one can show us that the Church of England and Ireland at the Reformation rejected any part of the Catholic faith, as it was held in the first ages, then we willingly admit that she ceased to be a true Church. But no one has shown us anything of this kind yet. And how can they, so long as she holds all the Catholic creeds.

We are truly happy to see that our correspondent does not reject the doctrine of St. Augustine, or count it preposterous in its consequences. We trust that friendly and candid discussion may yet bring him and us to be Catholics altogether and alike.

ORIGEN A HERETIC.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—As Mr. E. Power (most unreasonably, I think,) still asserts that you have yet given nothing against Origen, "more convincing than than mere assertion or individual opinion," will you allow me to refer him to St. Augustine de civitate Dei lib. 21. cap. 17.

St. Augustine there says—

"Illam (i.e. Origenem) non immerito reprobavit ecclesia."

"The Church, with good reason, hath rejected him (Origen)."

And the chief ground of this rejection he explains to be, that Origen held that *all* future punishments, even those of Satan, were purgatorial.

The Benedictine editor adds the following note:—

"St. Jerome testifies that the errors of Origen were

condemned by Pope Anastasius (Apol. adv. Ruff.* and epist. 78 ad Pammach); also by Theophilus, in a Council of Alexandria; after the time of Augustine, also, by Pope Vigilius and the Emperor Justinian. The fifth Ecumenical Council condemned the impious and absurd dogmas of Origen with many anathemas."

I know not, with this before him, how any Roman Catholic can continue to cite Origen as a faithful exponent of the Church's mind, and especially on the doctrine of purgatory.

I am, sir, yours,

DIEGO.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR NOVEMBER.

WHEAT sowing should now be proceeded with—completed within the month, if possible; and as the season advances, the quantity of seed should be increased.

Winter Vetches should be sown, if omitted last month, and finished as early as possible; so late in the season, they are best sown in ridges, and the water furrows well cleared up.

Bere.—Winter barley and bere and rye may be sown any time during the month, either for soiling, or to stand for seed.

Beans and Peas.—The sowing of winter beans, such as the Russian or Mazagan, should be no longer delayed; and gray peas may also be sown.

Swede Turnips, Mangel-wurzel, Carrots, and Parsnips should be all lifted, and stored early in the month. For details, see Operations for last month.

Parsnips for table use are better left in the land, and lifted fresh and fresh as required; but large field crops, intended for cattle-feeding, should now be lifted and stored.

Stall-feeding.—The cattle put up last month should now be so much accustomed to hand-feeding and house-management, as to be thriving rapidly; and their daily rations of turnips, oil-cake, bean, or other meal, be generally on the increase, till they get from 6 to 9 lbs. of oil-cake, or a compound of 4 to 6 lbs. of bean-meal, and 2 to 3 lbs. of oil-cake, according to size; they must be kept dry and warm, and well-bedded down with clean straw.

Sheep, also, intended for house-feeding, should soon be placed under cover; and when just put in should have cut turnips given them, very sparingly at first, to prevent scouring, when the allowance may be gradually increased to 1½ or 2 stones, with from ½ to 1 lb. of oil-cake, bean, or barley meal daily.

Breeding Ewes, by the close of the month, should be removed from the ram, and be allowed a spacious run on their winter pastures, which should be sound and dry, with good shelter to resort to in case of storms, and free access to good, sound hay.

Lambs, also, should now have good, sweet, but not rank pastures, and free access to dry, well-littered covered hovels, with hay, and be supplied with cut turnips, rather sparingly, just as much daily as they can eat up clean, and no more.

Stores.—Sheep should also have a liberal supply of roots and meal; and, as a general rule with all sheep, should have access to suit. The feet of sheep should also be constantly attended to, kept pared, and clean; and if there be any tendency to soreness or tenderness, dress immediately with the butyr of antimony.

Pigs.—Both fattening and stores should now have abundance of cooked food. The stores on steamed turnips and beans, with the offal from the dairy and kitchen; but those fattening should have a liberal allowance of grain with their turnips and potatoes. By the end of the month it will be a good time to send the sows to the brawn.

Grass Lands.—Continue manuring the grazing and meadow lands, with rich composts, farm-yard manure, bones, marl, or manure-gravel.

Water Meadows.—The sluices, ducts, and drains for irrigation should be looked to, and put in order; and any necessary alterations or improvements made without delay; that advantage may now be taken by those having a command of water to commence flooding the water meadows; and that those dependant on floods may be prepared to take advantage of them when they occur.

Fences.—This is a good time to plash and lay old fences; and lay out and plant new ones, when requisite.

Potatoes should still be planted in dry weather; early varieties and early planting being the best security from the disease.

Odds and Ends.—Keep the flail or thrashing-machine at work, to supply fresh straw for the stock; and, as the state of the market may advise, for the sale of grain; keep the teams either at plough or cart; go on draining and subsoiling where necessary; plough up grass lands where intended; scour out ditches and water courses; repair gates and roads; turn over compost heaps; cart home fuel, limestone, &c.; proceed with planting, felling timber, and cleansing coppices; and see that the water let over the irrigated meadows flows freely and constantly, without stagnating on the surface, and that the outlets are free and unobstructed.

* "Quid facient epistolæ Theophili episcopi? quid Pape Anastasii in toto orbe hæreticum persequentes?" Who the heretic was that was to be thus persecuted over the whole world, we learn from the previous sentence—"Non valet apud eos super Origenis damnatione episcoporum auctoritas." St. Jerome Apol. adv. Rufinum, lib. 1, p. 196.